THE COUNTER BVFFE

OR,

CERTAINE OBSERVATIONS upon Mr. EDWARDS his *Animadversions*, touching a Pamphlet intituled little *Non-such*,

Whereby is discernd how passion or spleene may transport (some that would be thought great Clerks which according to the Proverb, doth not alwayes prove the wisest Men.

To avoyd all partiality, we will first lay downe Mr. *Edwards* his own words, touching the three Heads he hath culd out of the aforesaid Pamphlet, and then our Observation upon each Shewing (in conclusion) how much hee mistakes the Right Independent.

If thy minde be busied elsewhere, lay this Booke aside till better leysure, it will require privacy and thy best Attention.

Non est bonum Ludere cum Sanctis.

LONDON,
Printed as formerly, for *H.P.* 1647.

18. 3 x 14. 3 cm
(1) 21 P

LIBRARY OF UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY,
NEW YORK.
GIFT FROM
DAVID H. McALPIN.

THE FIRST HEAD OF Mr. Edwards, LITTLE NON-SUCH.

PAGE 2.

THat God hath a bodily ſhape and proportion, Man was made according to the likeneſſe of God in perſonall ſhape; And God the Creator beareth the ſame ſhape in perſon which Man hath: This opinion was held by ſome Heretiecks in the fourth Century firſt known by the name of Audiani, and afterwards call'd Anthropomorphitæ. Auguſt. in his book de Hereſibus ad quod vult deum cap 50. Writes of them. Audianos quos apellant alii vocant Anthropomorphitas quoniam Deum, ſibi fingunt cogitatione carnali in Similitudinem Imaginis corruptibilis hominis.

Animadverſion.

Theodoret in his fourth Booke *de Hæreſib. fabuli*, Writes there was one *Audeus* who ſaid God was like to man and gave to God the parts of a man, who fell into this error by his miſunderſtanding of thoſe places of *Scripture*, which ſpeake of God according to mans underſtanding a

Danæus in his *Tractate* de *Hæresibus* fully confutes this opinion, and shewes the story of it; and that this *Heresy* should be now pleaded for in Print, it shewes how the Devill in these times revives old errors dead and buried for many hundred yeares.

The first Observation.

First, we give you to understand that the Contents of little *Non-such* are certaine Questions moved to be resolved in (under correction) as appeares in the preamble, and not positively maintain'd as matter of faith, as doth also appeare *page* 16. Therefore Mr. *Edwards* hath falsifyed the first Head, speaking his own words but not the *Authors*, nor yet their intentions: then all hee sayth to the matter is, that there were certaine *Heretickes* in the fourth *Century* cal'd *Audiani* & *Anthropomorphitæ* which maintained the opinion aforesaid. And how *Augustin* sayd they were so call'd, because they feigned unto themselves that God had a shape like unto corruptable man: and how then did they say that was a corruptable shape? hee saith also that *Danæus* in his *Tractate* confuted them, but hee neither shewes how, nor by what proofe of *Scripture* as is desired; so that the ignorant are nothing the more satisfyed by Mr. *Edwards* his Doctrine: then he seems to wounder how this *Heresy*, as he calls it, should be pleaded for in Print; we would here know of any reasonable man if the bare asking of a question be pleading for an *Heresy*; if this be faire play what call you *Legerdemaine*? There are yet more places in *Scripture* then are layd downe in little *Non-such*, which may move a man to aske such a question as that of *Gen.* 35 *v.* 9. Where God appeared unto *Jacob*, and then ascended from him in the place where he had talked with him, verse 13. this may imply some shape, else how did God appeare to him and ascend from him; then in the seventh of *Daniel v.* 9. Doth not the ancient of dayes sitting in a Robe with haire of his head as white as Wooll imply a shape also; yet notwithstanding these or any other Reasons out of *Scripture* and cited in Little *Non-such*, whatever the forenamed *Heretickes* thought wee assure Mr. *Edwards* that wee doe not make it our Creede, or thinke it any point of salvation to beleive so, well knowing (as is set forth in Little *Non-such*) that God is omnipotent, and that his power cannot be circumscribed in any personall shape or place; for wee can cite St. *Augustin* as well as Mr. *Edwards* and give him credit too, when hee saith curs'd is hee that referrs the *Deity* of God to the liniaments of mans body, for that were a narrow *Deity*, and we suppose no *Heretick* can be so grosse as to conclude in that manner; yet that each of the three persons have assumed shapes is confessed by learned men, but for what purpose or of what continuance they were or shall be, or what is the meaning of the words let us make man after our own *Image*, seeing the first man *Adam* was an *Image* of clay made in the six Dayes, but was not a living *soule* till God had rested the seaventh Day, and then breath'd life into him; These thing we would have

have learn'd from Mr. *Edwards* by ſome reaſons backt with *Scripture* proofe, but hee hath onely corrupted the meaning of the queſtion, and told a tale of *Heretickes*, ſo that our ſelves nor we ſuppoſe any other (by his *Animadverſion*, is any thing at all the wiſer.

The next Head is little Non-ſuch, *Page* 4.

Mr. Edwards, *The ſtory of* Adams *eating the forbidden fruit and of the Serpent is an* Allegory, *by the* Serpent *in that place is meant no other then* concupiſence, *and by the fruit of the Tree, ſome other eating then the eating of a* materiall Apple, *is underſtood.*

Animadverſion.

This alſo is an error revived, held by *David George*, who lived a hundred yeares ago; in *David Georges* life written in Latin by his Son in Law *Nicholus Bleſdikins* page 161. 162. 'tis related that by the *Serpent* entiſing our firſt parents, he meant *concupiſence*, and pleades for an *Allegoricall* interpretation of the *Serpent*, becauſe the Hiſtoricall narration of the *Serpent* as it is layd down by *Moſes* (ſayth *David George*) drawes divers abſurdities with it: the marginall Note here ſaith alſo that *Danæus* among other errors of the *Originiſts* ſhewes this to bee one, and how St. *Auguſtin* writ many Bookes againſt *Allegoriſts* and corrupters of Scripture.

The ſecond Obſervation.

Now if you marke how Mr. *Edwards* hath layd down this ſecond Head (inſtead of giving inſtruction) you will perceive how willing he is to pick a quarrell, for this is but a queſtion in little *Non ſuch* (as the former) and demanded with all modeſty, peruſe it who pleaſe, but ſetting aſide his ſpleene, let us examine his *Animadverſion*, and ſee what ſatisfaction it gives, which ſaith no more you ſee, but that it is an error revived, held by one *David George* as appeares in his life written by his ſon in Law *Nicolaus Bleſdikins*, and then how *Danæus* ſhewes it to be an error of the *Originiſts*, how if *Origen* had ſayd as much of him? and then he ſaith in the margent how *Auguſtin* writ againſt *Allegoriſts* corrupters of Scripture: what thinke you of this ſolution? is this a ſatisfactory anſwer to the queſtion in little *Non ſuch*? where is his Texts in *Scripture* to reconcile thoſe that are cited there, if the meaning be otherwiſe: what would hee make us believe there are no *allegories* in *Scripture*? we are not ſo ſimple to credit him in that point; wee know there are both *Allegories*, *Tropes*, and *Figures*, what admirable expreſſions is there in the Book of *Job*? what *Metaphors* and *Retoricall Figures*? and as one ſaith the *Retorick* of *Cicero*, *Demoſthenes*, *Hortenſius*, &c. is but a ſhaddow in compariſon; and in another place the ſame Author ſayth the Revelation is full of *myſterious metaphoricall* and *Hieroglyphicall* characters; And

And if Mr. *Edwards* would have us understand our Saviours words this is my body to be his Body, then we say Mr. *Edwards* is *popish*: *Tertullian* saith, it is but a Figure of his Body: And did not our *Saviour* in the *Gospell* deliver his Doctrine in *Parables*, and darke speeches, insomuch as the Apostles themselves sayd, Master what is the meaning, observe here the *Disciples* of *Christ* did not thinke it *Heresy*, to aske a question as Mr. *Edwards* doth: it is the manner of such as are able and willing to resolve doubts to compare one place of *Scripture* with another, and then to give us a right interpretation, if Mr. *Edwards* had done so here wee would have thanked him: concerning this portion of *Scripture* (if sufficeth us to know there was a breach of a Commandement in our first Parents, which hath inthrall'd us in *Originall sin*, but whether the words be *allegoricall* or *literall* (though we would willingly have knowne something of which M. *Edwards* (it seemes is Ignorantly silent) yet we say of this as the former, we make it no point of faith as touching our salvation: But for the third, and next in order, we verily believe it is as grose a peece of *popery* as is, or ever was since that wyly Father was rightly stiled an usurper.

The third Head is little Non-such, *Page* 5,6,7. *&c.*

Mr. Edwards, *in Marriage there are no degrees of blood or affinity forbidden, but a man may marry the next of kin to him, a Brother may marry his Sister, his Uncle his Neece, a Son his Fathers VVife, and so in any degrees without exception; so that if this liking to marry happen betwixt the neareſt of Kindred, then it is also the most naturall, the most lawfull, and according to the* Primitive *purity and practise.*

Animadversion.

The maine scope of this Book call'd little *Non-such*, or certaine new Questions is to plead for *incestuous Marriages*, where the Author sets himself to evade all the *Scriptures* in the old and new *Testament*, saying it is not Marriage simply with Sisters Brothers wives, &c. that is forbidden so long as a man keepes wholy to such a one, having taken her for a Wife, but the committing fornication with them not being Married: Now I shall shew the falsnesse of this by two *Scriptures*, the first in *Levit.* 18. where both in the Generall v. 6. and in particular the severall degrees are expressly forbidden v. 7. 8, 9, 10, &c. of the Fathers Wife of the Sister, of the fathers sister, &c. And where is the Author of that wicked Pamphlet pleads that uncovering of nakednesse is meant of fornication only and not of Marriage. I answer the holy Ghost in that Chapter expounds the uncovering of nakednesse to be Marrying, v. 18. and makes the taking to wife and uncovering of nakednesse to be the same as is evidently by these words, neither shalt thou take a Wife to her sister to vex

a *A flat untruth.*

her

her, to uncover her nakednesse besides the other in her life time, that is either thou shalt not take one Wife to another marrying another Wife having one or else marry the sister of thy Wife, whether shee be sister by father or by mother. Againe the holy Ghost in this Chapter forbids that which is is unlawfull with some kinde of persons, and not with all [b] and at some time, and not at others; Therefore limits to such a sort of persons, such degrees of bloud: but now fornication is unlawfull with all and at all times: A man may not uncover the nakednesse, that is, to commit [c] fornication with those that are remotest in bloud or Affinity, and that it must be understood so, is evident from the 19 *verse*, thou shalt not approach to a woman to uncover her nakednesse, so long as she is put apart for her uncleannesse, that is every man was to abstaine from his owne Wife during the time of her Monethly flowers, which necessarily shewes is meant of a mans Wife, for from all other Women a Man must abstaine alwayes, and it is never lawfull to approach to them, but even from a mans owne Wife over whose body he hath power at other times, hee is then to abstaine: Lastly, the Holy *Ghost* comes to speake of fornication, *vers.* 20. Thou shall not lie carnally with thy Neighbours Wife, there he forbibs fornication, but in the former part of the Chapter he forbad *incest* and *incestuous* Marriages: [d] The other Scripture is in the new *Testament* marke the 6. 17, 18. *verses*, where *John* tells *Herod* it is not lawfull for him to have his brother *Phillips* Wife, and this cannot be evaded by saying, *John* reproved *Herod* for taking her by force or living in fornication, but not barely for Marriage with her: for the Text saith expressly he had married her, and she was willing to it as appeares by the story, because she had a quarrell against *John Baptist*, and would have kil'd him for preaching to *Herod* against it, and afterwards watch'd her opportunity of revenge against *John* v 19. 24. prefering his head before half the Kingdome; I have beene the larger in this *Animadversion*, because of divers *sectuaries* and *incestuous* Marriages: I have the names of three *Independents* (given me out of one County) who have married *Incestuously*.

[b] *How prove you that?*

[c] *Contradicts himselfe.*

[d] *If all be true that you say.*

The third Observation.

This head because M *Edwards* will keepe his rode, hee makes positive also, wheras it is but a question as the two former; *Tene per asinum*, which at Bowles is as much to say as hold *Bias*: Then he sayeth the *Authour* sets himselfe to evade *Scriptures*, no indeed M. *Edwards*; but except there be more convincing reasons then you have showne, the *Authors* intent was, and is to prove by *Scripture*, that the prohibition mentioned is a *popish* injunction, not rightly grounded out of *Scripture*: They say also it is a sencelesse Prohibition, for as touching matters forbid in the *Decalogue* which is the ground of all Lawes, they are obnoxious in themselves (if there were no such injunction) both to the parties offending and unto them to whom the offence is given: but in the most affectionate mar-

riages,

riages, there is the moſt and greateſt good to both parties, which the *pope* or perhaps M. *Edwards*, would admit without a fee: The firſt head Mr. *Edwards* taxes as an *Hereſy* though it is but a queſtion asked: The ſecond Queſtion he calls an error, but for this third we are ſo much beholding unto him as hee calls it neither Hereſy nor error; yet in one place hee is pleaſed to ſay it is a wicked Pamphlet, this is hard too, for if one ſhould aske M. *Edwards* the way to *York* or to *Briſtow*; would hee ſay thou art a vile and a wicked fellow, thou ſhalt fall in the ditch before I will direct thee, is this charity to a ſtranger that is aſtray, what thinke you? now M *Edwards* if men ſhall fall from an error into flat *Hereſy*, yet St. *Jerome* tells us in *præf. lib. 4.* in *Jeremia*, it is to bee cut of with the ſword of the ſpirit, that is with the Teſtimonies of Holy *Scripture*, let us ſtrike through with the arrowes of the ſpirit and not by reviling and execration; but it ſeemes it is M. *Edwards* his manner to bee bitter, and to adminiſter Gall inſtead of Honey, for wee have ſeene a little *Pamphlet* that (for his invectivenes) calls him *Thomas* de *Gangrena*, which made us take him for a *Monſieur*, till a little after it ſayes hee is one of *Rabſhakaghs* Champions; well then if hee bee a Champion hee may perhaps when a place is voyd, bee one of the nine Worthies; but doubtleſſe hee will never be one of the ſeven Wiſe Maſters, till hee leave his reviling and give us inſtruction in the ſpirit of meekeneſſe.

And now though hee paſſe by the two former Queſtions without citing any *Scripture*, yet becauſe hee tells us hee will ſhew the falſeneſſe of this queſtion by two *Scriptures*, let him bee what Champion hee will, wee will here enter the liſts with him, and hope to foyle him at his owne Weapon, two *Scriptures* you heare him ſay, but if hee could have ſhowne the falſeneſſe (as wee have done the truth in the firſt part) by 22 *Scriptures* you ſhould then have heard his great Gun-cracke; well you ſee what flouriſh they have made at the firſt onſet, yet now you ſhall ſee theſe two, as well as the reſt, foigne againſt him and turne the point in his owne boſome.

The firſt *Scripture* hee cites is the 6, 7, 8, 9, and tenth Verſes of the 18 Chapter of *Leviticus*, which who ſo pleaſe to reade ſhall finde they ſpeake plainly of uncovering of nakedneſſe, and ſome Tranſlations renders it uncovering of ſhame; now wee never heard it was a ſhame to Marry or a ſhame to performe the Act of Marriage, but rather a duty commanded; Therefore (by his leave, wee yet conceive the interpretation of theſe Verſes in Little *Non-ſuch* to bee right, which underſtands them of the higheſt degree of fornication being committed with Kindred; And doth in the whole progreſſe of that diſcourſe deteſt it as much as M. *Edwards* can doe or any other, Then hee ſayth (if wee believe him) hee will prove uncovering of nakedneſſe and Marrying to be all one by the 18 Verſe, and cites theſe words neither ſhalt thou take a Wife to her ſiſter to vex her, to uncover her nakedneſſe, beſides the other in her life time: Doubt leſſe this is foule play and much

much detected in Little *Non-ſuch*, where it ſpeakes againſt plurality of Wives at one time: for if a Man having married a Wife and while ſhee is living, take her ſiſter to uncover her nakedneſſe, it is fornication in the higheſt degree, and wee ſay no other, but if the firſt Wife bee dead, then the ſame words ſeeme to imply, that hee may ſafely marry the other, elſe what neede theſe words *in her life time* for from thence wee argue *contrario*, that when ſhee is dead, her Husband cannot vex her by taking her ſiſter to Wife, as it would have done when ſhee was living, and it is no more but convertible with the Brothers caſe in *Deutronomy* if the firſt ſiſter die without iſſue: Though the *Patriark Jacob* married two naturall ſiſters being both living, which ſome ſay preſigures the *Law* and the *Goſpell* unto us, *viz.* by *Leah* (who was blear eyed, the Law is denoted unto us; and by *Rachel* (who was comly as the Spouſe in the *Canticles* and without blemiſh) is meant the *Goſpell*; yet ſeeing our *Saviour* ſayes, let every one have his owne Wife in the ſingular number, ſo farre wee agree with M. *Edwards*, if he pleaſe, that no man ought to have two Wives living at one time, but how he proves by this 18. verſ. that the precedent part of this Chapter is meant of Marriage, we doe not yet underſtand, but doe verily beleive by this 18. v. to prove directly the contrary: And now we call not for ſuch as will prejudicate or are ſelfe conceipted for want of wit and judgement, but to thoſe that are apprehenſive, and able to poyſe the weight of this argument: This 18. v. alleadged for his proofe, begins with theſe words, *neither* ſhalt thou &c. ſome tranſlations have it *alſo* and ſome *moreover*, it skills not much which of the three we admit of: for where the words neither, alſo, or moreover begins a ſentence, it likewiſe imports a new matter; then obſerve the precedent part of this Chapter, till you come to this 18. verſ. now in queſtion; the 6. v. ſaith none of you ſhall approach to any that is neere of kin to uncover their *nakedneſſe*, or their *ſhame* as ſome tranſlations have it: the reſt of the verſes following till you come to the 18. v. ſpeakes one continued phraſe, *viz.* thou ſhalt not uncover, thou ſhalt not uncover ſuch and ſuch, &c. but at the 18. v. comes in the words *neither* ſhalt thou take a wife to her Siſter to vex her in her life time, &c. the 19. v. begins with *alſo*, the 20. v with *moreover*, being all diſtinct matter from the former part of the Chapter. Therefore under favour, the 18. verſ. ſerves Maſter *Edwards* no more then the 19, 20. or the reſt of the verſes following, which are all of different and contrary matter; for we hope hee will not ſay that lying carnally with another mans wife or with mankinde, &c. hath any relation to *marriage*: Then we will here give you our ſenſe of this Chapter as we conceive it now, and muſt doe till ſome other hath opened the meaning better then Mr. *Edwards* hath done, *viz.* by the firſt part of the Chapter unto the 18. v. (and by the words uncovering ſhame or nakedneſſe) we are moſt eſpecially, forbid to make

con-

concubines, or commit fornication with any of our kindred, For though it might be unlawfull to doe it with any, yet you see the custome was amongst the *Patriarks*, and long time after in *Davids* and *Solomons* time to have many wives and *Concubines*, and though we ought not to injure any, yet least of all ought we to abuse our kindred, and for proofe of this we once more instance the 16. v. which saith thou shalt uncover not the *nakednesse* of thy brothers wife; but in *Deutromy*'tis said, thou shalt *marry* thy brothers wife; therefore we cannot say that uncovering nakednesse and marrying is all one, as Mr. *Edwards* doth, but verily thinke they differ as much in sense, as lawfull and unlawfull; for if these two places have one meaning, they make the holy Spirit contradict it selfe, which to say were no lesse then *blaphemy*; therefore we must needs reject Mr. *Edwards* his construction in this point, and thus farre as touching fornication with kindred: next we come to the 18. v. it selfe, cited by Mr. *Edwards* to a wrong purpose; for therein we say begins a new matter; the former part of the Chapter forbids fornication with kindred; in this verse we are forbid to have plurality of wives living at one time; by the 19. v. we are to avoid the uncleanesse of *menses pristuum*, to speake more mannerly then Mr: *Edwards* doth, by the 20 vers. we are forbid Adultery with our neighbours wife: the 21. forbids the abomination of passing the seed through the fire to *Moleck*, the 22 forbids *Sodomy*: the 23. forbids the Carnall knowledge of any beast, &c. these severall and distinct offences onely, we take to be the genuine sense of this Chapter, and that the forbidding of mariage cannot rightly be grounded from this place; but that the *Papacy* since it fell from integrity made use of it for *Lucre* as is amply declared in the first part; and this we are induced to thinke, not onely by the practise and custome, before the law to marry and raise up seed with their next of kindred, which we need not here repeate, because it is so largely set forth in little *Nonsuch*: for except Mr. *Edwards* can confute all those places there cited before, and after the Law, and shew us by other places of *Scripture* they have another meaning, he hath said nothing in his *Animadversion* worthy of regard, it rather seemes a Ridiculous *Aversion* from the truth: and further that this 18. Chapter of *Levit.* hath no meaning of marriage will appeare to them that are not wilfully partiall, in the 20. Chapter following, which appoints the punishment to such as transgresse these commands, and begins with the latter part, He that gives his seed to *Moleck* shall be stoned; the man that commits *Adultery* with another mans wife the *Adulterer* and the *Adulteresse* shall be put to death, then he that lies with his fathers wife, and he that lies with his daughter in Law, and if a man lye with mankinde, and if a man take a woman and her daughter, and if a man or a woman lie with a beast, and if a man take his sister and uncover her nakednesse, these are to be punished with death, we give you but the Abstract, onely he concludes this point, that

if

if a man uncovers the nakednesse of his brothers wife they shall dye Childlesse; which with the rest, do h fully fortifie our opinions touching the distinction we have made already, betwixt uncovering shame, or nakednesse, and marriage, for here's not a word of marrying you see, but of *Adultery*, uncovering nakednesse, lying carnally, &c. then shall we thinke that *Abraham* who tooke his Sister to wife, or he that is commanded in *Deuteronomy* to marry his brothers wife, deserved this punishment, surely no man of reason will say so; shall that holy estate be ranged in punishment with *Adultery*, *Buggery*, and *Sodomy*? God forbid: Then here in this 20. Chapter you see plainly if you please, what is meant by uncovering of nakednesse in the 18. Chapter formerly cited; that is the man that lies carnally with his Fathers wife, it doth not say one that married his Fathers wife after his decease, but he that lies with his Fathers wife, which is to be understood in his life time (or after not being married, and that is the fornication Saint *Paul* speakes of a fornication that was not committed among the *Gentiles*: And the man is meant also that lyes with his Sister as *Ammon* did with *Tamer*, and would not aske her of her Father for a wife; this is the uncovering of nakednesse that ought to be punished among the aforesaid abominations, and not the marriage of single people though they be of neerest kindred; for if that had been the Law *Tamer* would not have desired her Brother *Ammon* to aske her for a wife, and so have been guilty of her own death; but she knew marriage was safe and lawfull, and the fornication onely (in such degrees, so worthy of punishment, and of her so much detested. Are you satisfied yet Mr. *Edwards*? if not we will give you one gradation more, that we suppose will satisfie the intelligent Reader: in the 18. Chapter alleadged we have the *prohibition*, in the 20. the *punishment*, and if you peruse the 27. you shall also finde the *Curse*, we will recite it in order, beginning at the 15. vers. *Cursed be the man that maketh any graven or molten Image; Cursed be he that setteth light by his Father or Mother; cursed be he that removeth his neighbours landmarke; cursed be he that maketh the blind to wander out of his way; cursed be he that perverteth the judgement of the stranger, or Fatherlesse; cursed be he that lyeth with his Fathers wife because he uncovereth his Fathers skirt; cursed be he that lyeth with any manner of beast, cursed be he that lyeth with his Sister; cursed be he that lyeth with his Mother in law; cursed be he that smiteth his neighbour secretly; cursed be he that taketh reward to slay an innocent person, &c.* will you include the holy state of *Marriage* amongst these curses who will beleive you? though we like not *tautologies*, we cannot too often, (against this *Popish* yoake) remember the case of *Abraham*, of *Iudah*, of the brother in *Deuteronomy*, of *Boaz*, of *Tamar*, of the seven Brothers in the *Gospell*, withall the rest cited in the first and second part of this Treatise, which like unto so many linkes in a Golden Chaine do strengthen and confirme each other; then note the lying with the Fa-

1 Of Cor. c. 5.

thers wife, and uncovering his skirt mentioned amongst these curses in the 20.v. note also the 21. that speakes of lying with any manner of beast, the 22. of lying with the Sister, so that these emergent trespasses in kindred hedging in (as it were of both sides) the abomination of lying with any manner of beast, and therefore must of necessity be meant of the highest degree of fornication committed with the Wife in the Fathers life time, and with the Sister without marriage: and such is the uncovering nakednesse or shame in the 18. of *Levit.* for where marriage is spoke of indeed (as it is in so many other parts of the old and new Testament needlesse to rehearse, it is called in plaine and direct termes *Marriage*, admitting of no other attribute, be it with kindred or stranger. If the Adder will be deafe, the Charmer loseth his labour; some are infatuated with a blinde zeale without knowledge; some by an old custome (though evill in it selfe) not considering whether or no it was first introduced by an overruling power for covetous and *Monopolizing* ends; but to such as are of a cleare impartiall minde indued with sense and reason, the least of these plaine and manifest *Scripture* prooves will be sufficient.

In this place wee would take a little leave to let you know how M. *Edwards* in his *Animadversions* of this Head doth ingenuously give uncovering of nakednesse the same interpretation that wee do, saying a man may not uncover the nakednesse, that is, commit fornication with those that are remotest in bloud; and wee say much lesse with those that are the nearest: And now hee hath given it the proper sense, which is fornication, wee hope hee will no more call it Marriage: but what hee meanes by his story of Womens *flowers*, we do not well know except it be to make children wonder as hee himselfe doth to see a question or quere asked in Print: yet after all, if M. *Edwards* can shew us by the Originall in *Hebrew* and *Greek* that approaching to kindred to uncover their nakednesse (which you see himselfe sayes is fornication) or uncovering of shame and Marriage to have one and the same signification, and so to be understood in this *Chapter* against all other *Texts* before and after the Law he saith something; but we do more then suppose that in the *Originall* this uncovering of nakednesse will appeare to be committing of shame by fornication having no relation at all to marriage, more then the papish skill to *insnare* for fees: therefore his first place of *Scripture* hee boasts of, hath made against him and leaves him like a *Collier* grim'd with his own coles.

Next let us examine his other *Scripture* in the new *Testament*, where *Iohn* reproved *Herod* for taking his Brother *Phillips* Wife; this hee sayeth cannot bee evaded by saying hee tooke her by force and lived in fornication, for the Text sayeth hee had married her; no truly M. *Edwards*, we will not go about to evade it that way but wee will shortly tell you how wee will evade it and justly too; and though wee say of

Iohn

John as hee himſelfe ſayd of our *Saviour*, wee are not worthy to undoe his ſhoe latcher, nor preſume of the leaſt glimpſe of his *ſpirit*; yet we are not altogether ſo unlearn'd, or ignorant in humane knowledge, but we can condemne this fact of *Herods* as exceeding all example; for wee never reade that the very *Heathen* thought it lawfull to take away another mans Wife from him in his life time; and though wee reade that *David* committed *adultery* with *Barſheba*, and was a King as *Herod* was, yet hee did not take her away to himſelfe till *Uriah* was dead: now M *Edwards* may pleaſe to know that when *Herod* married *Herodias*, his Brother *Phillip* (her lawfull husband) was then living; for they were contemporaries, ſo ſaith *Ioſephus* their great and learned *Antiquary*, and ſome others curious in the ſearch of ſuch things ſay that *Phillip* outlived his Brother *Herod* (who wee know, died of a loathſome diſeaſe) they ſay alſo that *Herods* lawfull Wife *Mariamne* was living at the ſame time, and after her *repudiation* built that ſtately *fabrick* called *Miriams* Tower, which ſhewes as yet ſome ruins to this day in the place where old *Ieruſalem* ſtood, for all Travellers agree, that the new Town which now is, takes in very little of that which was diſtroyed by *Titus* and *Veſpatian*: but what need other Authors ſeeing the *Scripture* it ſelfe makes it plaine, for in the 3. of St. *Luke* the 1. *v* (and in *Iohns* Miniſtery) we reade that as *Herod* was *Tetrarch* of *Galile* his Brother *Phillip* was alſo *Tetrarch* of *Iturea* and the Region of *Trachonitis*, and in the 19 and 20 verſe of the very ſame Chapter wee reade that *Herod* being reproved for *Herodias* his brother *Philips* Wife and other evills, yet added one more, which was the putting of *Iohn* in priſon; ſo you ſee at that inſtant they were both *Tetrarches* of ſeverall *Provinces*, Therefore as touching this his ſecond proofe how abſurd it is, let the Reader judge; If the *popes* champions can fence no better wee ſhall eaſily give two hits for one: but to our buſineſſe you ſee M. *Edwards* both by our firſt and latter diſcourſe that we deteſt Fornication and Adultery more then you or any other can do that ſpeaks or writes againſt the marriage of ſingle people, and wee are ſo far from excuſing this act of *Hereds*, that we think it worthy of the puniſhment mentioned in the 20 of *Leuit* awarded againſt *Adulterers*, *Buggerers*, *Sodomites*, and ſuch as defile themſelves with beaſts, or lie carnally with their neareſt Kindred to uncover thier ſhame and nakedneſſe, which we, and ſo doth M. *Edwards* you ſee by chance interpret fornication: but to think the holy ordinance of marriage it ſelfe deſerves ſuch puniſhment in the next Kindred that are ſingle were great impiety, for that is a duty commanded often enough proved in the firſt part: neither are wee taught that ſimple fornication in them that were not of Kin was to be puniſhed with death, but the parties were to make amends by Marriage as appeares in *Deut.* Chap. 22. Ve. 29. Where if a man lie with a Damſell that is not betroth'd, hee ſhall give unto the Damſells Father fifty *ſhekells* of Silver, and after take her to Wife; and in the

the 19 Chap. of *Levit.* v. 20. Whosoever lieth carnally with a bond mayd, shee shall be scourged they shall not be put to death, &c. then the case of the *Midianites*, Numb. 31. and the *Levites* Judges the 19 mentioned in little *Non-such*, so that if there were no tolleration for simple fornication yet we see there was a connivency upon such and such penalties, but in Kindred within such a degree, it was punishable (and worthily too) with *Adultery* and other abominations formerly rehearsed; but what is all this to marriage with Kindred or strangers, which differs as much from all sorts of fornication as the East is from the West, surely that holy order can never come in question amongst these other enormities without grosse and couetous *popery* righily taxed in little *Non such*, and sufficiently opened both there and in this discourse; for shall we thinke that marriage with Kindred deserves greater punishment then the fornication aforesaid, if there were not so many *Texts* in *Scripture* that cals it holy, and so many other that commands the next Kinsman to doe that duty; yet it were against common reason, and the punishing of offences is plaine *mrality* within the compasse of our reason, it is no *mistery* to Rack our beliefe; So then fornication is a great offence, but we say it is the worst and highest in Kindred & deserves the greater punishment, because it is more unnaturall to abuse Kinsfolk then strangers. And now to conclude this point of *Herod*, the *Text* doth not say hee married one that had beene his brothers VVife, but one that was his brothers Wife, That is, at that time; Therefore *Iohn Baptist* worthily reproved him which makes nothing at all to M. *Edwards* his purpose, for if his brother *Phillip* had been dead, and his own Wife *Mirtamne*, hee might lawfully have married her according to their Jewish custome, and according to the *Text* in *Deuteronomy* as touching marriage with the brothers Wife: And that this is cleare as the day appeares in the 22 of *Matthew*, 12 of *Mark*, 20 of *Luke*, where the question is put to our *Saviour* touching the seven brothers that married successively one woman; if it had not been the custome and lawfull, ur *Saviour* would have reproved it, as hee did the 10th of *Marke* in case of *divorce*: wee know also our King *Henry* the Eight did (very little beyond memory) marry his deceased brothers wife, if it were not lawfull why did our *Clergy* consent unto it? you say he had the *popes* dispensation, oh had he so? hee would also have had that to have put her avvay, and no doubt but hee might have obtained it too (for money) had not the wyly father been afraid of the Emperor *Charles* the Fift, who was her brother: but yet it would not serve the turne, his conscience moved him so, we rather thinke it vvas his *concupiscence*; However there vvas packt some of his own *Clergy* and some in *France* that gave their verdit for him: Though othersome of the most pious and most learned * chose to lose their heads rather then consent: And how then, there was no such Kindred betwixt him and his next Wives to move his conscience, yet when his appetite served hee could finde a

* Sir *Tho. More.*

ready

ready way to chop off their heads, for to sue a divorce was too tedious: but we know that learned Knight Sr. *Walter Rawleigh* sayes in his Preface he was the only exact patterne of a mercilesse and *tiranicall* Prince, therefore hee can be no president for us to put away, or refuse our Wives that are of Kin to us. Neither have M. *Edwards* his two *Scriptures*, he boasts of, confuted our opinion, but (with the rest we have here cited) much confirmed and strengthened it: And though we detest and abhor Fornication and Adultery in all kinde of persons (but chiefely in Kindred) as much as M. *Edwards* or any one living; yet now wee (more then ever) avouch the holy estate of Marriage to be both commanded and the custome with the neerest Kindred as well after the 18 of *Leviticus* as before, even unto the time of the *Gospell*: as appeares in the case of the seaven Brothers formerly mentioned: It skils not much whether *Herod as* lately in our Discourse, was sister to *Herod* and *Philip* as some suppose by the name: It was in custome amongst the *Romans* to use those appellations as *Livius* the Brother, and *Livia* the Sister, *Tullius* and *Tullia*, *Octavius* and *Octavia*, &c. and what is in fashion at Court, you know, will shortly come into the Country, for *Herod* was a *Roman Tetrarch*, therefore this conjecture is probable; and if it were so, *Herod* was not reproved for Kindred sake, but for taking another mans Wife, and in that case *John Baptist* would have done no lesse if *Phillip* had not beene his brother; but setting these and many other apart that might be alledged to prove the custome, for a closing instance, wee say that *Joseph* and *Mary* the Mother of *Jesus* our blessed *Saviour*, were of a *Tribe* and Kindred as appeares by their *Genealogies* in the Gospell of St. *Mathew* and St. *Luke*; neither hath this prohibition, as we shall shew hereafter, any longer Pedegree then from such as (for gaine and lucre) hath tollerated Stewes and Ribaldry: for seeing S. *Paul* sayes Marriage is honorable in all without exception, as is set forth at large in the first part, wee say that repudiating Wives (except in case of *Adultery*) and forbidding of Marriage is flatly the Doctrine of Devills: observe the *Apostle* here in this [a] Chapter, sayeth this forbidding should be in the latter times; Therefore M. *Edwards* forgers himselfe much to cite *Leviticus*, which was in the first times, therefore not then to be forbidden; and wee are forgetfull also to trouble you twice with one matter, for by what you have formerly reade you may gather how hee consters that *Chapter* after the *popes* Grammer: and now because M. *Edwards* in this last *Animadversion*, speakes three times of *incestuous* Marriages, without giving us a definition what incest is, and sayes he hath (out of one County) the names of three *Independents* that have married *incestuously*: by this you see, hee is a *champion* indeed, and hath his intelligences to agravate his quarrell: yet seeing hee will not take the paines let us indeavour to give a definition to this *Bugbeare*, that these *Independents* (as he cals them because they have married with their Kindred)

[a] 1 Tim. 4.3.

Kindred may have the better ſatisfaction: firſt wee would aske M. *Edwards* how and from whence hee derives his ſo often Iterated word *Inceſt*: If hee will not tell us, then wee aske counſell of the *Grammarians*, whom wee take to be impartiall *expoſitors*; if it be from the verbe *Inceſto*, that they render to pollute and defile alſo to defile by reaſon of a dead body: if it be from *inceſtus* the adjective that they render polluted, defiled, *unchaſt*, and *whoriſh*: if it be from *Inceſtus* the ſubſtantive, that they likewiſe render *lechery* committed with one that is nigh a kin to him that committeth it; alſo all manner of pollution: now M. *Edwards* is not here the matter decided, which wee have debated in the firſt and ſecond part, here is the word *Inceſt* derived and deſigned which is to pollute or defile, to be unchaſt or *whoriſh*, to commit *lechery* with one that is nigh a kin; I hope you will not ſay there is either *pollution*, or *whordom*, or *lechery* in holy Wedlock; Then is not this the ſame that we ſay *Inceſtuous* Fornication, or *inceſtuous* lechery if you will, but for *inceſtuous* Marriage that ſmels of the Pumpe (of the *pope* and his champion wee ſhould have ſaid) wee have told you and proved it often to be a *popiſh gloſſe* for their profit, ſo we finde it and ſo we leave it; And for theſe three *Independents* you ſpeak of that have married their near Kinſwomen, if there be three ſcore of them, we ſuppoſe they will not love their Wives the leſſe for your aſperſion, but much dearer, becauſe it is preſumed they have married without any covetous ends according to the firſt and beſt inſtitution: but M. *Edwards* perhaps (like blind *Homer*) can write well of none that croſſes his humor. Laſtly, for concloſe we here intend to diſabuſe you becauſe you have abuſed your ſelfe, to take us for *Independents* that makes this defence; we do aſſure you we are none ſuch, if you mean that they are *Independents* which put down *Biſhops* we diſclaime the title, for wee approve their *function* though tis many yeares ſince we diſliked their *juriſdiction* and their Lordſhips, yet if a man have a lame Leg wee had rather cure him then cut off his head: And if you call thoſe *Independents* that would have no King or Government in Church and Common Wealth, we diſclaime that too, for wee would have both, knowing that God is the God of order and not of confuſion, wee further agnize our ſelves to be ſome of Queen *Elizabeths* proteſtants deteſting ſuperſtitious *popery*, and alſo much abominating theſe *colophantick* Sects and Sciſmes that have imbroyled our three Kingdoms; but if we be averſe to ſuch as terrify the conſcience that (by their own covetous and beggerly Rudiments) would reſtraine us from that Chriſtian liberty the *Goſpell* allows us, ſo far, we in depend, And deſire the reverſion of Romiſh dregs (with all new *Sects* and *Sciſm's*) may be purged away: As touching this forbidding of Marriage, we have ſufficiently already, and may move amply hereafter prove it to be a *popiſh* Relique; then ſeeing you will have no *Biſhops*, wee deſire ſuch Lawes and *cannons* as were made in the time of Superſtition, and continued by them, may be burnt and imbezeld, becauſe they

they have moſt impiouſly ſerved not onely to puniſh, but alſo to take away the lives of devout Chriſtians, and alſo to divide bodies vvhoſe hearts vvere rightly united, and ſuch as God hath commanded that no man ſhould put aſunder. And in regard you ſay you have ſtruck off the head of *Antichriſt*, let us deſire you to cut of the *Tayle* too, and vvee vvill be all friends. Now M. *Edwards* becauſe you ſay you are large in your *Averſion*, vve therefore ſay vve have bin the larger in our *obſervation*.

The reſt of the third Book of Gangrena *wee have not peruſed, nor did we greatly thinke it worth our labour; onely we accidentally ſaw a little* Pamphlet *formerly named, that ſayes you write perniciouſly even to the taking away (if it were in your power) the lives of ſuch as onely deſire as they profeſſe, the freedome of a good conſcience, with the ancient lawes and liberties of their Native county.*

If this be ſo it is not vvell; vve ought to reforme one another in the Spirit of meekneſſe, and not vvith revilings and threatnings: but not to medle beyond our ovvn matter, vve conclude your *Animadverſions* to be meere temporiſers from vvhence vve can gather neither Wit, Learning, or Inſtruction, and ſo vve give you the *Bonus noctius*, leaving you and your other *Antagoniſts* to decide your other differences.

And now a little diſcourſe to ſuch as have married their neare kins-Women, vve knovv there is a *popiſh* injunction that forbids marriage in ſuch and ſuch degrees, and great penalties deviſed by the Civill Lavv, vvhich have no other ground but from the *popiſh Canons*: Then hovv muffled in error have vvee beene in theſe latter times, to maintaine ſuch opinions and yet vvith all (till novv of late) believe the *pope* had povver (for his profit) to diſpence with what degree he pleaſed: but above all obſerve the ridiculous reaſons that ſome alledge to uphold that diveliſh Doctrine, for ſo it is call'd in the Text: And indeed one Author ſayth truly, within ſome ſhort time after the Apoſtles, It behoved there ſhould be great ſtupidity and blindneſſe, elſe how ſhould *Antichriſtianiſme* be introduced to the full, as ſince it hath been; but to returne and aquaint you with one of the aforeſaid Reaſons ſome alledge *Ariſtotle*, a heathen Philoſopher, that in his 9 Hiſtory *Animar.* Chap. 47. tells you a tale of a Camell that kil'd his keeper for ſuffering him to couple with his dam, and another of a horſe that likewiſe ſerved his Dam, and after ran to the Sea and lept from a Rock into it: behold here what ſhall we thinke of *Authors* that cite ſuch matters to men that have reaſon? as if beaſts that have no reaſon were to be our preſidents for our life and converſation; for what man that hath ſo much wit as *Camell*, *Horſe* or *Aſſe* can believe that the foreſaid accidents happened thorough the cauſes ſpecified, as if there was never *Camell* before or ſince, that kil'd a man, or horſe

 that

that drowned himselfe, who is it amongst us that hath kept a breed of Cattell, Sheepe, or studd of horses and Mares? but the males in their seasons, have intermixt with the females promiscuously; and have wee not often received losse in our said goods many severall wayes, and our servants hurt and sometimes kil'd by horse and beasts? What then? shall we attribute those accidents to the mixture of our beasts in their severall kinds? or shall we esteeme them uncleane and not feede upon them? if we do we shall loose our reason, and surely become more brutish then they; but what impression can not any fable make where the reasonable part is set aside, and ignorance become the Mother of devotion? It is the *Popes purgatory* pickpurse that hath broach'd a hundred of these impostures; for the reasonable part of this Argument against marriage in kindred, hath no better emphasis or grace then if a man should say, I have as good provision (of all kinds) at home, as I can finde in the market, but yet it doth not like me, Therefore I wil seek further to please my appetite; how then? will you approve of his judgement that will leave his own eates, which hee knoweth to be good and wholesome, to buy abroad that which may be corrupt and deceitfull, as often times it proves? Even so have wee better cause and opportunity to know the vertues and qualities of our neareſt Kindred then of strangers; Therefore seeing wee finde in *Scripture*, it was the practise of the *Patriarkes* and our forefathers to chuse their Wives out of their owne stock, and was with all (before and after the Law, a duty commanded; (we do not say but since the Gospell there is a Christian liberty) yet if such liking happen now amongst the neareſt of kin without any lustfull desire, but onely for *propagation* and reall intent of marriage, vve see no cause why any (that have not lost their sense) should give credit to heathen fables or seeke to pope for a dispensation.

Another reason there is alledg'd and that by one that would be thought a great *Doctor*: A man of great Reading no doubt hee vvas and able to cite many Authors; but we have a saying the greateſt Clerks are not alwayes the wiſeſt men; And wee know there are divers who have writ great Volums, and yet had not the true genuine sence of matters, nor a right interpretation; but let us see what weight the reason hath which hee brings against this nearneſſe of kindred: That it is not lawfull sayeth hee, to marry ones Sister doth appeare by *Abrahams* denying *Sarah* to bee his Wife amongst the *Ægyptians*, but sayed shee was his sister: observe well this passage was not this to save his life? reade his Story and you will finde them his owne words; for shee might have beene his sister and not his Wife, and then it had beene no offence to him if another had taken her in marriage; but being his sister, and his Wife also the case was far otherwayes, for then hee feared they might have killed him to have had her free to themselves, because it was not lawfull amongst the most barbarous heathen to take another mans Wife:

And

And now marke with all the ſame anſwer of *Abraham* to *Abimelech* in his returne, *viz.* She was his ſiſter, and yet afterwards when *Abimeleck* knew ſhee was his Wife, and blam'd him for conce aling it, *Abraham* replied he thought the feare of God was not in that place, and that they would have kil'd him for her (the Text ſayeth ſhee was a faire Woman) yet he had not wholy d ſtembled, for ſhe was his ſiſter the Daughter of his Father and ſo became his Wife. Therefore it is lawfull (by his example) to marry the Siſter; ſo the reaſon that this *Doctor* brings makes juſt point blank againſt himſelfe: And here we would aske him how the World was peopled after the Creation, and after the *deluge*; was it not by the iſſue of *Adam* and *Noe* (that is) by naturall brothers and ſiſters? Oh, but you will ſay, then there was a neceſſi y, and we ſay there is no neceſſity to do that which is unlawfull, and if it were lawfull then; the reaſons and circumſtances of theſe times makes it lawfull now; for where ſo many Families of beſt integrity are rooted out of their Cuntry by wicked *Sects* and *Sciſms*, together with a moſt inhumane and an unnaturall civill War, and thereby forced to ſeeke habitation amongſt the heathen in unplanted Countries, why ſhould not they propagare in their tribes as our fore-fathres did: of this opinion are ſome *Doctors* moſt abſolute, well known to us for piety and learning; but what will not ſome other *Doctors* doe? when *popery* is in requeſt they have reaſons for that: when the *Presbytery* Carries it, then that is highly extol'd; when the *Independency* hath ſway, that muſt be defended too: was it not well prayed of him that deſired to keep his ſoule from a *Church-man*, his body from a *Phyſitian*, and his Eſtate from the *Lawyer*: but doe not theſe things give occaſion of ſcandall to our Chriſtian Religion even amongſt the *heathen*? God grant that our errors may be errors of ignorance rather then of preſumption or againſt conſcience; and that we do not with ſome ſtraine a Gnat and ſwallow a Camell; ſuch as would deny this primitive ordinance as touching Marriage (wherein there can be no prejudice if parties be ſingle, and their intentions reall) and yet admit of groſſe ſuperſtition in *popery* with other *Hereticall Sects* and *Sciſmes* alſo, which hath opened ſo wide a gap to all impiety.

Wee muſt not forget another reaſon that ſome alledge againſt this nearneſſe of kindred, that is, they have known many miſchances happen to ſuch; ſo have we known many bleſſings powred upon ſuch, and doth all other matches thrive that are not of Kin? This reaſon is as like the fire as ere it may look; either it comes from an old Wife, a young novice, or the *popes* broker; for what is this to ſay, but if you marry your Kindred (without the *popes* licence) you can never thrive; this is a great ſcarcrow to the coverous, and hath ſo infatuated the debauch'd and ſimple ſort, that they had rather commit fornication with twenty ſtrange Women then live in holy Wedlock with one of their Kindred. But leaving this as neither worthy of regard or further anſwer, one thing more we would in-

timate unto such as M. Edwards cals *Independents* for marrying with their Kindred, and in their tribes, namely the time about which this divelish Doctrine (of forbidding marriage) came into these Western Islands; and also who they were that set it abroach; but because we wil forge nothing of our own braines we will cite you a warrantable Record. We read that in the year 1172 *Christianus* the *popes* Legate, *Donatus*, *Lawreance*, and *Catholicus Archbishops* with their Suffragan *Bishops*, *Abbots*, *Priors*, *Deans*, and *Archdeacons* with many Prelates, &c. These sayth the Irish Chronicle kept a Synod at *Cashell*, debated many matters, made sundry Statutes and wholesome Lawes; *viz.* that people should refraine to marry with their neareſt kinsfolks; that children should be Catechiz'd without the Church doore, Baptized in the Font, &c. That every one should pay their Tythes of Cattle, Corne and all other encrease, faithfully to the *Church*: that *Church lands* should be free from all other exactions of Lords, Noblemen, &c. no *cuddies cosheries*, *coigne* & *livery* to be within the *Church* territories: when any *Earick* or cutting lay upon the people for murder, or head money, no person of the *Clergy* (though they were a kin to the murderer) should contribute any thing but all to lie upon the Laiety; That any person dying should give the third part of his substance for the oversight and performance of his Will; Now you must imagin that charge will fall to Sr. *John* our Parish Priest, brother Monke, or fryer, &c. This is sufficient to let you know of what nature these Lawes were of, and to whom they were wholesome: The Clergy you see were very kinde to themselves; but perhaps the Layety (that must beare all the burden) had little reason to thinke them either wholesome or toothsome; seldome shall you see them make any Lawes against their profit; neither was their prohibition in matter of Marriage the least accession thertunto. Their *dispensations* mentioned in the first part have beene well payed for; yet to forbid the Banes with one hand and to joyne them together with the other for money, what thinke you, is it not *Hocus pocus*? who is it but knowes it a lawfull Ordinance, or else that it cannot be made so for money; well then, the time these lawes were made is here to be observed 1172. And by whom? but by such Law mongers as Tolerate *Jewes* and *Stewes* for annuall Rents: Then was it not neare the time that the *Bishops* of Rome usurpt the title of Universality, though some of themselves rebuked *John Bishop* of *Constantinople* for affecting the same. I suppose it was, and from which time forwards their *Transubstantiation*, their selling of pardons, their giving of Kingdoms, their Buls and Excommunications with many devises besides have imbroyled all Christendome. It is further to be observ'd that *Ireland* did flourish in learning and piety: And it is needlesse here to recite the holy lives of *Patricius*, his contemporaries and successors, seeing their *History* is so frequent, except wee could have found this prohibition in their time, which nowhere we read of: Then are we confident it hath

no

no elder birth then the times aforesaid, when all corruption, bribery, and symony crept into the *Arch prelacy*. And now if it be granted that the foresaid marriages in the next of kindred be lawfull (for so we take it till we be convinc'd by Scripture, and that expounded without temporising, partiality, or private interest) then it may be demanded what inconvenience there is in it, except some will say you doe not wisely to stand upon the first ordinance to the prejudice of your estate; that is, to take your Kinſ-woman with nothing when you might have a stranger with money: wee doe not reade that *Abraham* had either, Lands, or Goods with his Wife and sister *Sara*; or *Jsack* with *Rebecca*, but sent presents to obtaine her; or yet *Jacob* with his Wives, but served two prentiships for them: of Marriages made for encroaching and covetous ends (and Lawes made against it even by the very *Heathen*) there is enough sayed in the first part: for wee finde that marriage was ordained to *propagate* and multiply Man-kinde, and not to beget money; So then the kindred being agreed according to the first institution, and intire affection, the inconvenience is none amongst them: whereas in other covetous matches there is frequent quarrelling: as in the *Clandestine* and stolne Marriages, what suits and troubles ariseth; And also in others fashion'd by compact in case of not performing *joynture* one the one side and detayning portion on the other, which begets perpetuall brauling, and not seldome doe they mistake the way to one anothers bed; whereas to these other conjoynings proceeding from that consionable duty injoyn'd to the next kinsman (and where naturall affection invites) all such jarrs and contumelies are avoyded. Then wee cannot too often reiterate the covetousnesse of the *pope*, and his Clergy (with other secular Magistrates who have dranke too deepe of that Babyloniſh cuppe) in making Lawes to prohibit so just an ordinance, and yet (for money) dispense with their owne edicts. Therefore wee concurre in opinion with him that sayeth * an unlawfull custome ought not to bee binding, neither can course of time mend that which was naught from the beginning; for what it not grounded upon good right is not made good by continuance: observe that *Augustine* also in his Booke *de vera Religione*, Cap. 31. *mihi lex esse non videtur quæ justa non est*, it seemes to mee sayeth hee to bee no Law at all which is not just: And how contrary these humane injunctions are to Divine Ordinance, is elegantly proved in the first part (intituled Little *Non-such*) if what you reade here bee short of your expectation.

* *Ulpian.*

As touching the most famous of the *Heathen* (which History Records unto us for Armes and learning) who Married in the very neareſt degrees; as *Cyrus*, *Antiochus*, *Ptolomy* and so many more, which to recite were to goe on *ad infinitum*; neither neede wee them for president.

president, having (in *Scripture*) so many of the fathers and *Patriarks* : onely this wee mention to shew the practise and custome both with *Jew* and *Gentile* (for ought wee know) till the VVorld was old five thousand Yeares and upwards, for untill the Yeare 1172 formerly mentioned, wee have not read of any such prohibition ; If any doe informe us better, wee shall not bee deafe to understand it, and then you perceive from whence it came ; to helpe your memory, wee once more tell you from the *Pope* and his *Clergy* who (for money, will dispense nevertheleſſe and tolerate *Jewes* and *Stewes* to boote ; what *Martyrs massacrees* and blood-shed their Lawes, *Cannons*, and inquisition with their other plots and practises, have made since that time in Christendome, wee suppose is yet fresh in your memory : Therefore wee wonder not as Mr. *Edwards* doth at his shaddow, when hee speakes of pleading for an *Heresy* in Print, whereas (you see) it is no other then a bare question, but wee wonder the *Pope* should finde Champions to plead in Print (for his fees and extortion) against the holy institution of Marriage ; for wee can discerne no other source or Fountaine from whence that divelish Doctrine proceedes : now if any can shew us wherein wee are mistaken, they shall perceive wee are not impetuously obstinate, provided alwayes they take the Scripture for their guide ; for as one sayeth *Diamonds* can onely cut *Diamonds* ; and no such Comments on the *Scripture* as the *Scripture* it selfe : Then if severall Texts of the old and new Testament, cited here and in the little *Non such*, touching Marriage, the practise and example of the Fathers before and after the Law, bee refuted with so many other Texts equivalent and interpreted without partiality, wee are satisfyed ; else the *popish Cannons* and *Heathen* fables, do not affright us, but gives us cause to detest their impiety.

Lastly, for percloſe to such as inveigle their kindred and make them *concubines*, or commit Fornication with them, wee wish the punishment allotted in the 20 of *Leviticus*, to them and the like capitall offenders : But such as doe really (and with their good liking) make them their Wives according to the holy Ordinance, wee pray for, and wish them the blessings of *Abraham* and *Sarah*, *Isack* and *Rebecca*, with the rest of the Fathers and *Patriarches* which Married in this manner : for where there is neither Covetousneſſe, Ambition, or sensuality but onely motives in conscience to performe the Kinsmans part (to use the words of *Boas* * to *Ruth*) out of a duty commanded ; no doubt but God will accept the good intention and give it a blessing accordingly.

* *Ruth* ca. 3. vers. 13.

Postcript

Postcript.

IF *any suppose there are digressions in this discourse that savor, somewhat of the* Satyre: *To the affable and judicous Reader we give this satisfaction: That true it is, M.* Edwards *his Rigid phrase did stir up no spleene, but a little just indignation; for by his taxing the questions in little* Non-such *with the words* error, Heresies, *wicked* Pamphlets Incestuous, Independents, &c. *We imagine he was a little* besmeared *with choler or something else, which made him cleare mistake the matter; for we doe not thinke, under favour, that the asking a Question (with modesty) deserves such Epithetes: (i)* Agrippa *believest thou the* Prophets? *I know thou doest sayeth *St.* Paul; *he and the rest of the* Apostles *did (as it were) angle for soules by Doctrine and example, not with reviling and threatning; And if any shew us the errors in little* Non-such, *or in this second part (occasioned by M.* Edwards *his invective) and will doe it (as our* Saviour *commands) in love and the spirit of meekenesse, founding his tenents upon* Scripture (*as is desired*) *and with an unbiassed intention, we will then esteeme him highly, give him great thanks, and heare him gladly.*

* Acts 29 vers. 27.

FINIS.